

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Craig Roshell Maxwell,	)	
	)	C/A No. 4:14-2732-BHH
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER
vs.	)	
	)	
MCCDU,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This case is before the Court because of Plaintiff's failure to comply with the magistrate judge's Order of August 26, 2014, ECF No. 5, and because of Plaintiff failure to provide the Court with an updated address.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge ordered Plaintiff to submit items needed to render this case into proper form within twenty-one days, and specifically informed Plaintiff that if he failed to do so, this case would be dismissed without prejudice. The Court has not received any response from Plaintiff, but the mail in which the Order was sent to Plaintiff (twice) at the address provided when the case was filed was returned as "undeliverable."

Plaintiff's failure to provide the Court with an updated address indicates an intent to not continue prosecuting this case, and subjects this case to dismissal. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)(district courts may dismiss an action if a Plaintiff fails to comply with "any order of the court."); see also Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982)(court may dismiss sua sponte).

Accordingly, this case is dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall close the

file.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

September 29, 2014  
Greenville, South Carolina

---

<sup>1</sup>Under General Order, Misc. No. 3:07-5014-JFA, this dismissal without prejudice does not count as a “strike” for purposes of the “three strikes” provision of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). If Plaintiff wishes to bring this action in the future, he may obtain new forms for doing so from the Clerk’s Office in Columbia (901 Richland Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201).